

other ways. Finally, a balanced budget amendment should distinguish between general operating expenses and capital investments (such as bridges, research, or education). Indiana has operated under a similar system for years. Like a homeowner taking out a mortgage, borrowing for long-term investments can make sense.

#### REASONS TO SUPPORT

Despite these concerns, I do support a balanced budget amendment. For years Congress has tried new ways to reduce the deficit, including caps on spending, across-the-board cuts, and pay-as-you-go requirements. These measures have had some effect, and the deficit is down from a record \$290 billion in 1992 to some \$176 billion this year—a cut of 40%. But the longer-term outlook for the deficit—particularly because of rising health care costs—is not good. Particularly disturbing are recent projections by the Congressional Budget Office that show the deficit could rise to as high as \$421 billion in 2005. This trend is unacceptable.

Although I would prefer that Congress and the President face the tough choices and balance the budget on their own, there is little evidence this will be done. Large deficits drain national savings and investment in long-term economic growth, and yearly interest payments prevent policymakers from responding to new challenges. A balanced budget amendment would force us to better reconcile our investment priorities with our economic means.

#### THE DETAILS

The House considered six versions of a balanced budget amendment. I supported several versions that protected Social Security from being cut to balance the budget and a version that would distinguish between capital investment and general operating costs. I also voted for a version that would require Congress to spell out the difficult choices necessary to balance the budget in the next seven years. We have an obligation to tell the American people how we intend to get the budget into balance. Too many amendment supporters are unwilling to give us specifics on cutting the budget. The cuts necessary will be far deeper than most people have acknowledged, and important programs like Medicare and student aid would be heavily impacted.

I opposed a version that made it easy to waive the balanced budget requirement—in any year when unemployment was above 4%—and also did not support a version requiring a separate 3/5 vote to pass any bill that raised revenue. We should not confer on a congressional minority a veto power over what should be a majority decision to increase revenues. Such a veto power was deliberately rejected by the founding fathers.

A broad coalition of members from both parties were able to put aside their differences and agree on the final version of the amendment. This amendment would be tough on deficit spending. It would require the President to submit a balanced budget every year, and Congress would need a 3/5 vote in both the House and the Senate to pass an unbalanced budget or to raise the federal debt limit. A majority of Congress could waive this requirement in time of war or imminent military threat. The amendment now goes to the Senate, which is expected to take action later this year. If the House and Senate agree on identical language, thirty-eight states will have to ratify the amendment before it becomes part of the Constitution. The states will be taking a careful look at the balanced budget amendment. It could well hurt them. Drastic reductions in federal spending would leave states with the burden of dealing with those who fall through the safety net.

#### CONCLUSION

I still have reservations about the House version, and would prefer greater flexibility to deal with national emergencies, protections for Social Security, and requirements that we spell out to the American people what it would take to balance the budget. I believe the House-passed version was good enough, and the need for a balanced budget amendment strong enough, that the process should go forward. I am hopeful that the Senate can address some of my concerns. I will want to see what happens in the Senate before making a final decision on the balanced budget amendment.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE CLARE ROTARY CLUB

#### HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 8, 1995*

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Rotary Club of Clare, MI. On February 11, 1995, members and friends will gather to celebrate the Clare Rotary's 50th golden anniversary. The Clare Rotary Club has enjoyed a long and distinguished history during which they helped and improved many lives. They may proudly look back on their history and take pride in the many events they have sponsored and the assistance they have provided.

The Rotary Club plays a vital role in the development of our families and communities. By selflessly giving of themselves, members have demonstrated the rewards we reap when we help others in need. The time and effort the members have devoted to improving the community illustrates the sensitivity and caring that makes the Rotary Club of Clare the wonderful organization it is.

Their work and accomplishments provide a sterling example of what deeds can be performed with dedication and contribution. Everyone involved with their efforts lives by the motto, "He Who Profits Most \* \* \* Serves Best" and more recently, "Service Before Self." These are words that, when taken to heart, can help raise people, families, and communities to new levels of achievement. The Rotary Club members have not only embraced these words but acted to help others and inspired us all to help our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I know you will join my colleagues and I in commending the work of the Rotary members and their 50 years of giving. It is this sense of philanthropy, the cornerstone of our Nation, which has made this Nation and community such an exceptional place to live. I wish them continued success and look forward to another 50 years of service.

#### LEGISLATION TO NAME YOUNGSTOWN COURTHOUSE AFTER THOMAS D. LAMBROS

#### HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 8, 1995*

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation to name the Federal building and U.S. courthouse in Youngstown, OH after retired U.S. District Court Judge

Thomas D. Lambros. Throughout his distinguished career, Judge Lambros embraced the rule of law, human rights, and social justice for all our citizens. I can't think of a more appropriate way to honor his service than to name the U.S. courthouse and Federal building in Youngstown, OH after this great American jurist.

The bill would designate the Federal building and U.S. courthouse located at 125 Market Street in Youngstown as the Thomas D. Lambros Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse.

Thomas D. Lambros was born on February 4, 1930, in Ashtabula, OH. He graduated from Ashtabula High School in 1948. Upon graduation from high school, he attended Fairmont State College in Fairmont, WV, from 1948 to 1949, and received his law degree from Cleveland Marshall Law School in 1952. From 1954 to 1956 he served in the U.S. Army. In 1960, Lambros was elected judge of the court of common pleas in Ohio's Ashtabula County. In 1966, he was reelected to a second term without opposition.

In 1967, in light of Judge Lambros' excellent record as a fair and dedicated jurist, President Lyndon B. Johnson nominated him to the Federal bench in the U.S. District Court in the northern district of Ohio. As a district court judge, Judge Lambros was responsible for many important reforms such as the voluntary public defender program to provide indigent criminal defendants with free counsel. His groundbreaking work in this area preceded the landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Gideon versus Wainwright*, which guaranteed free counsel to indigent criminal defendants. In 1990, Judge Lambros became chief judge in the northern district of Ohio. He officially retired from that post earlier this month. Judge Lambros currently resides in Ashtabula, OH.

Judge Lambros received numerous honors and awards throughout his career, including the Cross of Paideia presented by Archbishop Iakovos of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, and an honorary doctorate of law from Capital University Law and Graduate Center.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also add that it was Judge Lambros' commitment and vision that was the driving force behind the construction of the Federal building and U.S. courthouse in Youngstown. He recognized that the people who live in the Youngstown area—regardless of their station in life—deserve to have adequate and direct access to the U.S. court system. Prior to the opening of the U.S. courthouse building in Youngstown in December of 1993, my constituents had to travel at least 65 miles to Cleveland, OH if they had business in the Federal court system. Judge Lambros recognized the hardship this imposed on many people, especially senior citizens and the indigent. His commitment to equal justice and equal access for all played an important role in building the Youngstown courthouse. My constituents and I will be forever grateful to Judge Lambros for his broad vision and commitment to justice.

I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation, the text of which appears below.

H.R.—

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.**

The Federal building located at 125 Market Street in Youngstown, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the "Thomas D. Lambros Federal Building".

**SEC. 2. REFERENCES.**

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Thomas D. Lambros Federal Building".

IN HONOR OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN JOSEPH A. LEFANTE WHO WAS RECOGNIZED BY IRELAND 32

**HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 8, 1995*

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to recognize the accomplishments of former Congressman Joseph LeFante, who was honored on January 20, 1995 by Ireland 32. He is an outstanding citizen and his service to the American people is second to none.

Mr. LeFante was born in Bayonne to Thomas and Rose LeFante. He was raised in Bayonne and attended St. Peter's College in Jersey City. He has been married for 46 years to his high school sweetheart, the former Florence Behym. They have three beautiful children Janice, Tom, and Diane, and five grandchildren.

His achievements and his awards are numerous and exemplary. Mr. LeFante was a member of the U.S. House of Representatives in 1977-78. He served on the Committee on Education and Labor and Small Business Committee. His expertise was crucial in drafting important legislative proposals in these areas. He was the only freshman member to serve on the Select Committee on Welfare Reform.

Prior to his congressional career, Mr. LeFante distinctly served on the New Jersey General Assembly. He was an assembly speaker in 1976, majority leader in 1974-75, chairman of the joint appropriations committee in 1973 and chairman of the assembly appropriations committee in 1972-73. He was commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs. In 1990 for 2 years he served as director at the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs at the New Jersey Department of Environment Protection and Energy.

Mr. LeFante has also been a member of several commissions, such as the Bayonne Charter Commission and was the director of the Hackensack Meadowlands Development Commission. In addition, he was a member of the Bayonne Municipal Council where he served as chairman of the urban renewal program, the code enforcement committee, and the drug abuse committee.

Mr. LeFante has received countless honors and awards for his outstanding work and dedication. He has been honored by St. John's University with an honorary doctorate of humane letters, Jaycees Distinguished Service Award, and the Dr. Benjamin Rush Humanitarian Award just to name a few.

It is impossible to state all of Mr. LeFante's achievements. He has served his community with dignity and respect. He has been a great

humanitarian by serving and helping the public. He is a distinguished gentleman respected by all. I commend him for his countless efforts to help others and for giving his time to help and aid the community.

**CLEANING UP THE WELFARE SYSTEM****HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 8, 1995*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, we've heard a lot about the tough decisions that need to be made in order to clean up the welfare system and put our economy back on track. Cutting off payments to families or putting funding into State block grants are not the tough solution to our welfare problems. I often make note of the fact that, as a State legislator I had to deal with block grant issues. Most often, it is only a way of moving the responsibility for painful cuts to the States. The block grants proposed by the Republicans drastically reduce funding for these programs but these proposals oversimplify a very complex problem and do not sufficiently address the factors that contribute to unemployment and welfare dependency.

Yes, we should cut the waste and abuse in the system. I agree that we should root out the fraud in our welfare programs. But, the fact is that real welfare reform must also address job creation, job training, and an increase in the minimum wage. I'm very glad to be participating in this special order this evening, organized by Mr. SANDERS and Mr. OWENS. These are issues that must be addressed in any welfare reform bill and they must be addressed by any government that hopes to lower its unemployment level while raising the standard of living of its people.

I do not know anyone in this House, Republican or Democrat, who would argue with the premise that our ultimate goal in welfare reform is to move people off of the welfare roles and into jobs. We must, however, make sure that people are getting good jobs that provide a livable wage. I believe that the majority of people on welfare right now would jump at the opportunity to work and provide for themselves and their families. What, then, is preventing a welfare recipient from finding a decent job? Those jobs that are within a person's grasp do not pay enough to sustain a family and due to lack of training, higher paying jobs are also not within their reach.

Earlier this week, I spoke on the House floor about the choices a single mother on welfare would face. If she goes on welfare, she can get comprehensive health care and a monthly check from the Government. If she goes to work at a minimum wage job she earns only \$8,800 a year, and her family loses their health coverage. She must find a way to care for her children while she is at work. That is not much of a choice. Throwing these women off the welfare roles will not erase these problems. That is a smoke and mirrors reform.

The Republican approach to welfare reform limits benefits to 2 years, and only 2 years. I have no problem with moving people into the work force as soon as possible, but we must face the fact that, if the jobs are not there, no punitive measure will change the welfare recipient's behavior. The Economic Policy Insti-

tute estimates that there are over 12 million unemployed people in this country. These people must be trained for jobs which will raise them up out of poverty and give them stable income.

Today's minimum wage is worth 30 percent less than what it was worth in the 1970's. An increase in the minimum wage is a necessary step in providing people with the tools they need to bringing themselves out of poverty. We cannot move welfare recipients into a position where they join the growing number of working poor. Of all poor children, 38 percent under 6 years old have parents who work full or part time. They are working to support their families but cannot make enough money to live above the poverty line. In 1992, a full-time worker only grossed \$8,800, that is \$3,500 below the poverty line for a family of three: \$11,186. How can we expect to move welfare recipients into this subsistence level of employment with no health care and no job training?

We must create a system that rewards work and does not punish someone for trying to be independent. We must make the tough decisions. We must say that job creation, training and an increased wages are national priorities. We must commit to programs that will help us reach a goal of a stable, self-sufficient employment for all Americans.

**INTRASTATE MOTOR CARRIER  
TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL  
CORRECTIONS ACT****HON. NICK J. RAHALL II**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 8, 1995*

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress passed H.R. 2739, the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994, which included a provision in section 601 to preempt State economic regulation of intrastate trucking. Today, I am introducing a technical corrections bill to address an item which I do not believe Congress intended to be within the scope of section 601.

The primary thrust of section 601 is to address issues relating to the transportation by motor carrier of general freight and express small packages. The act clearly provides for continued State regulation of safety requirements and the transportation of household goods.

During consideration of this legislation, however, nobody with the exception of myself raised the question of how it could affect other types of motor carriers, such as tow trucks. And indeed, today, many police departments and municipalities are faced with a great deal of uncertainty over the effect the legislation will have on what is known as nonconsensual towing, that is, that towing which is conducted without the vehicle owners consent. This is the type of towing that occurs when a vehicle is illegally parked on private property, or the vehicle is towed by order of the police.

In this regard, some local public entities believe that they can engage in contractual relationships with one or more tow truck operators for the purpose of providing nonconsensual towing services. Others contend this practice would represent the regulation of rates and